



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,901	11/30/2001	Steve Ko	P2394-508	3253

7590 05/04/2005

James W. Peterson, Esquire  
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

HAILU, TADESSE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/996,901

Applicant(s)

KO, STEVE

Examiner

Tadesse Hailu

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Amendment submitted/entered with filing of RCE on April 4, 2005 for the patent application number 09/996,901.
2. The pending claims 1-7, and 10-29 are examined herein as follows.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 10-20, and 23, 24, 26 through 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans et al (WO 01/44918 A1) in view of Taylor et al (US Pat No 6,034,687).

The present invention relates to the display of information messages, such as warning or error messages associated with various elements within the GUI. Likewise Evans et al (Evans) relates to selectively providing or notifying non-modal error information in a GUI. Evans also anticipates most of the claimed subject matter of the present invention as follows.

With regard to claim 1:

Evans discloses a method and arrangements for providing non-modal error information in a graphical user interface.

The method includes among other things monitoring user's activities to determine whether message should presented to a user (page 3, lines 5-11, page 6, lines 1-8 page 7, lines 11-16, page 8, lines 5-21).

The method also includes based on the monitored condition, such as if password entry is incorrect, then the authorizing program generates or selects a corresponding message (page 7, lines 11-16, page 8, lines 5-10).

The method also includes monitoring the user activities also include identifying locating a target object (input field 110) associated with the action (password entry) performed by the user, to which the information contained within the notification message relates (page 7, lines 11-16, page 8, lines 5-22).

The method further includes displaying notification object tip balloon 118, which indicates the target object (input field 110) and contains said information message (error information 116) corresponding to said condition (incorrect password entry), in a persistent manner until dismissed or deactivated by a user (via clicking/selecting) or until it disappears within a predetermined time period while enabling the user to continue interaction with an application program corresponding to said target (input field 110) (page 7, lines 11-page 8, lines 2, page 8, lines 11-22).

Although Evans describes his invention under graphical user interface environment incorporating windows, wherein minimizing, maximizing, closing etc are typical user actions on a displayed windows. But Evans does not teach "selectively displaying said notification object in a second, collapsed state having a reduced size relative to said first state." However, Taylor discloses notification message box (e.g.,

Figs. 9F (a) and (b)) (column 19, lines 20-34). As illustrated in the Figs., the notification message box can be minimized by pressing the typical minimized button as shown in the message box. Thus, minimizing the message box creates said second display state (i.e., collapsed state) as claimed.

Evans and Taylor are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, graphical user interface.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the tip balloon (notification object) of Evans with the minimizing feature of the notification message box of Taylor will enable user to view the entire displayed information.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Evans with Taylor to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

With regard to claim 3:

Evans in view of Taylor discloses said tip balloon **118** (notification object) comprises an error message **116** (Fig. 2).

With regard to claim 4:

Evans in view of Taylor discloses said tip balloon **118** (notification object) comprises reminder information **116** (notification) (page 7, lines 6-10).

With regard to claim 5:

Evans in view of Taylor discloses said balloon **118** (notification object) includes a speech bubble having a cartouche, which points to the target (Fig. 2)

With regard to claim 7:

Evans in view of Taylor further discloses displaying message balloon 118 also includes generating system beep (an audio indicator) (page 7, lines 17-21).

With regard to claim 10:

Evans in view of Taylor further discloses displaying said notification object in collapsible state in response to a mouse event (see Taylor, Figs. 9F (a) and (b), As illustrated in the Figs. Figs. 9F (a) and (b), clicking the minimize button sends the notification message box to said second state (i.e., collapsible state).

With regard to claims 11 and 12:

Evans in view of Taylor further discloses said notification object contains control icons or buttons, and in response to a click and/or a keyboard command on to a minimize icon or button the notification object will be displayed in collapsible state (Taylor, Figs. 9F (a) and (b)).

With regard to claim 13:

Evans in view of Taylor further discloses that the tip balloon (notification object) is persistent and remains displayed until user corrects the incorrect password entered to the to the input field 110. Again, if the user does not retype/enter the correct password to the input field 110 the tip balloon will reappear again until the incorrect password (condition) is removed (page 7, lines 11-23).

With regard to claim 14:

As illustrated in I Fig. 2, and as described in page 3, lines 7—11, Evans in view of Taylor further discloses that the tip balloon (notification object) is displaced from said target object so that it does not interfere (obscure) said target object.

With regard to claims 15:

Evans in view of Taylor further discloses that said tip balloon (notification object) is non-modal and enables the user to continue interaction with an application program corresponding to said target while said object is being displayed (Abstract, page 3, lines 1-11).

With regard to claim 16:

Evans in view of Taylor further discloses that since said tip balloon (notification object) is a non-modal (or modeless), it enables a user to interact with application programs other than the application program (such as selectable user areas 106a-b (Fig. 2, page 6, lines 17-23) corresponding to said target, while said object is being displayed.

With regard to claim 17:

As illustrated in Fig. 2, Evans in view of Taylor displays the tip balloon 118 (the notification object) when an application associated with said target is active (see the active target input field 110). On the other hand since the selectable user areas 106a-b are not active a tip balloon is not displayed nearby these selectable user areas or icons.

With regard to claim 18:

Independent claim 18 corresponds generally to independent claim 1 and recites similar features in system form, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

With regard to claim 19:

Evans discloses a graphical user interface element (GUI display 100, Fig. 2) for providing a user with information (102, 106a-b, 116, etc) regarding a computer application being executed (e.g., logon with password prompt 108), comprising a non-modal tip balloon (118) (notification object) containing an indication mechanism (in the form of a speech bubble, 118) which forms part of said object and points to a target within said computer application with which the computer notification object is associated (also see page 6, lines 1-23), said user interface element being displayed in a first state (i.e., not minimized state) that contains information relating to said target (Evans , Fig. 2).

Although Evans describes his invention under graphical user interface environment incorporating windows, wherein minimizing, maximizing, closing etc are typical user actions on a displayed windows. But Evans does not disclose selectively switching said user interface to a second, collapsed display state that omits at least some of said information.

However, Taylor discloses notification message box (e.g., Figs. 9F (a) and (b), column 19, lines 20-34). As illustrated in the Figs. 9F (a) and (b) the notification message box can be minimized by pressing the typical minimized button as shown in the message box. Thus, minimizing the message box creates said second display state (i.e., collapsed state) as claimed.

Evans and Taylor are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, graphical user interface.



At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the tip balloon (notification object) of Evans with the minimizing feature of the graphical user interface or message box of Taylor will enable user to view the entire displayed information without obscuring the underneath information object.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Evans with Taylor to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

With regard to claim 20:

Evans in view of Taylor further discloses the GUI 100 providing textual information (error information 116, Fig. 2) to the user.

With regard to claim 23:

Evans in view of Taylor discloses a tip balloon (notification object) with said indication mechanism (in the form of a speech bubble) comprises a cartouche (see Fig. 2, 118).

With regard to claim 24:

Evans in view of Taylor further discloses displaying message balloon 118 also includes generating system beep (an audio indicator) to a user (page 7, lines 17-21).

With regard to claim 26:

Independent claim 26 corresponds generally to independent claim 1 and recites similar features in storage medium form, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

With regard to claim 27:

As illustrated in Fig. 2, and as described in page 6, lines 1-23, and page 7, lines 3-16, Evans in view of Taylor discloses receiving an action performed on a computer (GUI display 100) by a user, such as entering/typing a password (Fig. 2), then based on the user entry the information to be provided to the user is determined.

With regard to claim 28:

Evans in view of Taylor further discloses that the user interface element is switched to said collapsible state in response to user interaction with said icon (i.e., by selecting the minimized button/icon within the message box) (Taylor, Figs. 9F (a) and (b) ).

With regard to claim 29:

Evans in view of Taylor further discloses that the notification object includes a control element (i.e., minimize button), and the notification object is displayed in said collapsed stat in response to user activation of said control element (Taylor, , Figs. 9F (a) and (b) ).

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans et al (WO 01/44918 A1) in view of Taylor et al (US Pat No 6,034,687) further in view of Webb (Pub No US 2003/0011639).

With regard to claim 2:

While Evans in view of Taylor discloses balloon 118 (notification object) including error messages, suggestions (page 6, line 6, and reminder information (page 7, line 9), but the balloon 118 does not show a warning.

Webb discloses a non-modal dialog box, which may also include text or a message (e.g., an alert warning or error message) to the user 114 (paragraph [0010]).

Webb, Evans and Taylor are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is graphical user interface.

At time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the warning messages of Webb for the error messages of Evans in view of Taylor because Webb teaches that such warning messages warn of potentially harmful actions to the user of the system (paragraph [0008]).

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide instructions through warning messages.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Webb with Evans and Taylor to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

5. Claims 6, 21, 22, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans et al (WO 01/44918 A1) in view of Taylor et al (US Pat No 6,034,687) further in view of Wishoff (Pub No US 2002/0051017).

With regard to claims 6 and 25:

Evans in view of Taylor discloses automatically bringing in and removing the message balloon 118 (notification object) to and from the display, this act of bringing in and removing the message balloon is not quite an animation motion. Thus, Evans in view of Taylor does not disclose expressly that the displaying includes providing a video animation sequence. Wishoff discloses displaying animations on the desktop. Wishoff also discloses when notifying users of events or conditions, small animations

are played in place of the icon and a message is displayed in a single-line text window called the notify window (see paragraphs [0060], [0124] and [0128]).

Wishoff, Evans and Taylor are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, notification for the graphical user interface environment.

At time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the message balloon 118 of Evans in view of Taylor with animation sequence during display in order to alert the user that the application wants the user's attention (see Wishoff, paragraph [0060]).

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to get the user's attention.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wishoff with Evans in view of Taylor to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6 and 25.

With regard to claims 20 and 21:

While Evans in view of Taylor indicates that other information could be provided through tip balloon 118 (page 6, lines 7-8), but Evans in view of Taylor is silent in mentioning the other information.

However, Wishoff discloses a notification object that comprises a selectable icon or button (see paragraphs [0010], [0060], [0124] and [0140]).

Wishoff, Evans and Taylor are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, notification for a graphical user interface environment

At time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the tip balloon 118 of Evans in view of Taylor with selectable icon

Art Unit: 2173

or button during display in order to alert the user that the application wants immediate user's attention (see Wishoff, paragraph [0060]).

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to get an immediate response/attention from the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wishoff with Evans and Taylor to obtain the invention as specified in claims 21 and 22.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### **Conclusion**

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Tadesse Hailu, whose telephone number is (571) 272-4051. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 10:00 - 630 ET. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached at (571) 272-4048 Art Unit 2173.

8. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Tadesse Hailu  
Patent Examiner  
Art unit 2173

